

but the reality is there are places in the country that are still adversely affected.

I went through Nome, Alaska, last summer coming back from ANWR. One of the OB doctors there said, boy, I hope you get that done because we need an anesthesiologist here and we cannot afford the liability premiums. I said, How do you do obstetrics without an anesthesiologist? He said, If someone needs a C-section, we put them on a plane to Anchorage. Anchorage is an hour and a half away, and I am given to understand there is bad weather from time to time in Nome, Alaska. I fail to see how we are furthering the cause of patients' safety by allowing this situation to continue.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately we have a President right now who will sign medical liability if we will get that bill passed. I am not supposed to mention the name of his opponent, but I do not believe his opponent will do that because he has either been absent or voted "no" when that has come up in the Senate.

HOW PHYSICIANS WILL BENEFIT FROM NEW PRESCRIPTION DRUG LEGISLATION

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Medicare prescription drug bill and one of the other great benefits that has come to our Nation, and that has been in the physician payment arena.

First, this law will block the impending physician payment cuts that were scheduled for 2004 and 2005, as well as give physicians increases of 1.5 percent for the next 2 years. In Illinois where we are losing physicians because of medical malpractice issues, having a provision that keeps doctors in Illinois is very, very critical. As a result of overturning the cuts and increasing the payments, Illinois stands to keep 400 million for Illinois physicians and the patients they serve. The geographic payment adjuster has been set at 1.0 in 2004 through 2006, which affects how physicians are paid in different regions of the country. The agreement also provides for physician scarcity bonus payments from 2005 to 2007. These grants go to those who practice in areas where there is a shortage of physicians.

Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of physicians in Illinois because of medical malpractice, and physicians are leaving the State. At least in the Medicare prescription drug bill, there is help for keeping some of those.

TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES AND SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, this spring as we complete another tax season, families and small businesses have reason to celebrate. Thanks to our \$350 billion tax relief bill which the President signed into law last year, working taxpayers are getting back more of their hard-earned money. Families now have more money to put food on the table, pay their mortgages, and pick up school supplies for their kids. These families know the truth about taxes, that it is their money, not Washington's money. Letting them keep their money has helped put the economy back on track. This relief has given families and working taxpayers a smaller tax bite, an increase in the child credit to \$1,000, and yet another reduction in the marriage penalty. No wonder families this year have reason to celebrate.

I am happy to report for the first time in a long while unemployment is down in my home State of Montana. Montana's jobless rate is now just 4.6 percent. Why? Because government does not create an economy, businesses do, one job at a time.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say I am looking forward to voting on the budget later today. This budget is a good document because it does what we know works to get the deficit under control. First, it restrains spending, extremely important. Second, it allows the economy to continue to grow, as my friend from Montana just talked about, by not raising taxes on the American people. Significantly, the budget also provides for the prescription drug benefit this Congress passed late last year. After spending 5 years talking about it, a lot of rhetoric, a real political football, we finally on a bipartisan basis provided prescription drug benefits in a meaningful way.

What numbers will we be relying on in the budget? We will rely on the Congressional Budget Office, as under the rules of the House we are required to do. There has been a lot of discussion about what numbers we should use. Of course we are going to use the Congressional Budget Office as we must. There are other estimates out there. Some may be right, some may be wrong; but this Congress is doing the right thing by providing a prescription drug benefit and providing under the rules of the House for the right estimate of those costs.

HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. CHOCOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues that we face as a Nation today domestically is the rising cost of health care. The most ef-

fective way to address that issue is to return more ownership and control of health care coverage. That is exactly what the health savings accounts created under the bipartisan Medicare bill do. HSAs are portable accounts that allow individuals to save and withdraw tax-free dollars for their health care needs and medical expenses not covered by their insurance. Individuals own the accounts and the savings can be carried over year after year and from job to job, and people can build wealth into their retirement.

By offering individuals ownership and control of their health care coverage, we return control to the patients; and that is exactly where it should be. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues who have voted to support the bipartisan Medicare bill which will help reduce medical expenses and improve the health care system in America.

BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the budget today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will talk about their budget for America, which includes repealing tax cuts we fought so hard for. But their quote-unquote repeal is nothing more than job-killing tax increases on American workers. Period. Their alleged "plan" would blow America's economic engine. It would be like hitching a heavy trailer to the back of a motor scooter. I cannot think of a better way to turn it into a dead weight, a useless vehicle that would take us nowhere. Job-destroying tax increases are like a trailer full of bricks that will stop this economy dead in its tracks.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass a budget that strengthens our national defense, a budget that grows our economy, a budget that creates jobs, a budget that will get rid of Washington waste and excessive spending. We have that opportunity today, Mr. Speaker. Let us take advantage of it.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 393, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 574 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 574

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009. No further general debate shall be in order. The concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), ranking minority member of the committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 574 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2005. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consider-

ation of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The rule further provides, upon the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, for a final period of general debate not to exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Finally, the rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency and provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2005, H. Con. Res. 393, provides for \$2.4 trillion in total Federal spending for the next fiscal year and sets us on course to cut the deficit in half in 4 years. The resolution provides for total discretionary spending of \$818.736 billion in fiscal year 2005. Discretionary defense spending is at the President's requested level of \$402 billion. The resolution also accommodates the President's requested increase in homeland security, minus a 0.5 percent efficiency savings. Non-defense, non-homeland security spending is held level for fiscal year 2005. The resolution also responsibly provides for up to \$50 billion in fiscal year 2005 for additional costs related to operations in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Total veterans spending is increased by \$1.2 billion for the next fiscal year, and the resolution does not include any of the fees proposed in the administration's budget.

It should be noted, also, Mr. Speaker, that no new mandatory spending is provided for in this resolution. Reconciliation instructions are included directing the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill by October 1 that prevents a tax increase over the next 5 years. Without a change in the law, expiring provisions in the 2001 and 2003 tax relief bills would result in a tax increase on Americans beginning next year. The resolution also accommodates changes needed to write permanently into law the \$1,000 child tax credit, the marriage penalty relief, and setting the lowest income tax bracket at 10 percent. Additional reconciliation instructions direct five House committees to report bills by July 15 of this year to eliminate \$13.2 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse from government programs over the 5 years of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Rules and Budget Committees, I would like to congratulate Chairman DREIER on a fair rule allowing for open debate and Chairman NUSSLE for producing a budget that is focused on defense, economic growth, and our Nation's long history as a land of opportunity. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this budget is about securing America, creating jobs, and responsible planning. American families do not have unlimited bank accounts.

□ 1030

They have budgets, and they prioritize how they spend and save their money. The Federal Government must set budgets and prioritize spending as well.

This budget continues our commitment to defense and homeland security as the Federal Government's number one responsibility, just as our Founding Fathers intended. It provides for increased funding to help secure America's borders, defend against biological attacks, protect our critical infrastructure, and train and equip our first responders. And it takes a comprehensive, responsible approach to protecting our Nation, winning the war on terror and preparing our military for future security threats and challenges.

Mr. Speaker, by avoiding tax increases and protecting the child tax credit and relief from the marriage tax penalty and relief for lower-income workers, our budget continues the policies that are helping our economy to recover.

Our economy is growing, not as fast as I would like, but it is headed in the right direction, and we need to keep it on track that way. Raising taxes would stop this growth dead in its tracks.

I believe in balanced budgets, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to have served in the House when Republicans produced the first balanced budget in 40 years. But I do not believe in balancing the budget by simply shifting the burden to American workers, families, and business owners in the form of tax increases. Our budget is focused on allowing the Committee on Appropriations to make the responsible spending choices and fund the highest priorities within the overall framework established by this resolution.

We provide for full funding of the Medicare law to provide seniors help in paying for their prescription drugs for the first time ever. We continue the yearly increases in education spending and fund the No Child Left Behind Act so that our children are better prepared for the future, and we provide an additional \$1.2 billion for veterans' health care.

Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from Iraq, and that trip served as a close-up reminder of the hard work and sacrifices made by those who serve in the Armed Forces. We made our promises to veterans, and those promises must be kept. Our budget provides for these priorities, strengthens our defense, and puts us on track to cut the deficit in half in the next 4 years, with declining deficits in the future, and is accomplished without raising taxes on the American people.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, Economics 101 tells us that if we spend more than we make, we quickly find ourselves in a hole. And as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) often says when asked about the Federal deficit, the first thing we have to do when we find ourselves in a hole is stop digging. Well, Mr. Speaker this country has been digging for 3 straight years, and the result is a very, very deep hole.

Three years ago we projected a surplus of \$432 billion for fiscal year 2005. But the Republican budgets of the past 3 years have changed a few things. We now face a deficit of \$521 billion this year; a debt accumulation of \$1.2 trillion over the last year, this year, and the next; and deficits will continue as far as our forecasts go. That is a dangerous trend, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell the Members why.

Budget deficits and the ensuing debt are bad for the economy. That is a view that almost all economists share. The current chairman of President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers, Harvard Professor Gregory Mankiw, even agrees. As a matter of fact, I have right here his well-known and respected 1998 economics textbook, "Principles of Economics." In it, Professor Mankiw wrote about what he called "... the most basic lesson about budget deficits," that when a government runs a budget deficit, investment falls and the economy's growth rate is reduced.

This is a very important point to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the budget deficit can really harm the economy, especially since the jobs outlook for the 8.2 million unemployed is getting worse, not better. The latest Labor Department numbers show the average length of unemployment is now up to 20.3 weeks, the longest duration of unemployment in 20 years. Coupled with the administration's refusal to extend unemployment benefits, the situation for the jobless looks bleak and unlikely to improve.

It did not have to be that way, Mr. Speaker. Our Nation's surpluses were meant to shore up Social Security for the retiring baby boom generation and pay down the national debt. This may sound familiar to anyone who may be listening to the debate today, and it should. Mr. Speaker, for the third year in a row, this House is considering a budget that makes deep funding cuts to our national priorities while at the same time it drives America deeper and deeper into debt.

There is only one way to dig ourselves out of this hole now, Mr. Speaker: by working together, as a national family, to restore fiscal responsibility. That is how families across the country operate. They take an honest look at their expenses, their debts, and their income, and then they sit down at the kitchen table and work it out.

That is what Democrats have tried to do repeatedly with the Federal budget. We have repeatedly urged Republicans to forget politics as usual and join us in a bipartisan budget plan that does not bankrupt our grandchildren.

Last year, Democrats offered a budget that would have saved our Nation and our grandchildren almost \$1 trillion in debt over 10 years. I need to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The budget Democrats proposed last year cost almost \$1 trillion less over 10 years than the Republican budget. That is a phenomenal number, but not one Republican Member of this House voted for that bill, not one.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President's tax cuts permanent, a goal that Republicans have repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.

At best, the Republican budget will dig our Nation deeper into debt, leaving us with a \$377 billion deficit in 2005, spending the entire \$1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009, and leaving America with deeper deficits far into the future. It is an irresponsible proposal brought to us by the leadership of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting sick and tired of this. The American people deserve better, and they expect that Congress will act in their best interest, not spend the Social Security surplus and burden their grandchildren with debt. I believe that America deserves better than this partisan misleading and divisive resolution. That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of the Democratic budget alternative.

The Democratic budget resolution will provide real fiscal discipline, with a balanced budget over 10 years, by extending pay-as-you-go rules to both spending and tax cuts and by offsetting the cost of tax cuts through reform measures such as closing costly loopholes and eliminating abusive tax shelters. There are no tricks, no gimmicks, and no hidden costs.

The Republican budgets of the past 3 years have clearly led America in the wrong direction. And what do we have to show for 3 years of fiscal mismanagement, 2.9 million fewer jobs, paltry funding for education, health care, and other national priorities, and a \$1.2 trillion debt for our grandchildren to pay. The budget resolution before us today will only compound these problems.

If Members of Congress are really serious about reducing the debt, they would vote today for the Democratic budget alternative. Democrats have put together an honest proposal to reduce the deficit, invest in our Nation,

and restore fiscal responsibility in the budget process. It is the right and responsible vote to make for this country, its economy and its people. And that is why I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Democratic budget alternative.

The American people deserve no less. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this restrictive rule and to the underlying budget.

Yesterday I offered two amendments in the Committee on Rules. By the way, both of these were job amendments. One of these amendments would have increased funding for the Army Corps of Engineers, which is woefully underfunded in this budget before us. The other amendment would have protected families and communities throughout the West by providing the necessary funding for hazardous fuel reduction programs.

What the hazardous fuel reduction program does is it helps stop all of those horrible forest fires we were having in the West, it protects communities, it protects homes and it protects healthy trees so that they can be logged. And at the same time it also provides jobs.

When we look at cutting the Corps of Engineers' budget, what does that budget do? Why would we increase it? It is the budget, it is the organization that dredges all of my coastal communities that keeps those communities alive. It provides transportation, water transportation for over \$1 trillion worth of goods in this country.

Neither of those amendments, or many others, were allowed under this rule.

My home State of Oregon has the highest unemployment in the country, and our coastal communities have been very hard hit by the economic downturn. These communities depend on fishing and tourism, and without dredging and other harbor safety measures undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers, these industries would be further devastated. This budget sets the wrong priorities for our Nation, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time, and if he is prepared to yield back his time, I am certainly prepared to yield back my time. Perhaps the 6 hours of debate took all the steam out of what we have been talking about here.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman that we do have some speakers and one is here currently.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities, and I believe that the priorities outlined in the Republican budget plan are not the priorities of the people of this country.

This Republican budget is a blueprint to protect tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of everything else. I disagree very strongly with the approach being taken by the Republican leadership. This budget plan is bad for America. It is bad for our most vulnerable citizens. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for our war on terrorism, and it is bad for our future. The Republican budget resolution will inflict terrible damage on American families.

This budget cuts \$358 million from health programs in the year 2005. It cuts environmental protection programs by \$6.4 billion over 5 years. It fails to provide needed funding for veterans' health care. It underfunds homeland security programs. It fails to include the promised funding for No Child Left Behind. It makes college more expensive for our families by freezing the maximum Pell grant and cutting funding for Perkins loans.

I am also dismayed that this budget fails to provide adequate funding for our food aid programs around the world. Winning the war on terrorism will take more than dropping bombs on people. Food aid is one of the best things we can do to boost the image of the United States in other countries. It is a way to win friends and to demonstrate to the world what we are for. This budget goes in exactly the opposite direction, and it is wrong.

And it is outrageous that the Republican leadership refuses to talk straight with the American people about the issue of the budget deficit. For better or worse, the budget resolutions presented in this House have become partisan documents. As I said, perhaps better than anything else, these budgets reflect the priorities of the two parties.

I understand that, for the most part, the Republican leadership believes that every problem can be solved by throwing bigger and bigger tax cuts at the wealthiest Americans and corporations. But it used to be that the Republican Party also stood for fiscal responsibility.

I am a liberal Democrat, but I must say that I learned a lot during the debates of the 1980s and early 1990s. I learned that controlling the deficit is not only important to a strong economy, it is essential. And I give a lot of credit to some of the people on the other side of the aisle and especially to the Blue Dog Democrats, who were

among the first to bang the drum of deficit reduction.

What happened to the Republican Party? Where have all those people gone who used to care about the deficit? This Republican budget resolution will increase the deficit by \$247 billion over the next 5 years. I have to believe that whether one is a liberal or a moderate or a conservative, they will find this budget fiscally irresponsible.

□ 1045

And it has huge consequences, not only for future generations, but also for the most important task of this generation: winning the global war on terrorism. It becomes harder and harder to take the offensive against terrorism when we are mired in debt, and the Committee on the Budget refuses to include any budget process reform like the so-called pay-as-you-go rules to deal with the problem.

Now we are told that how we pay for things is a separate discussion, and we will have a debate on pay-as-you-go mechanisms next week or the week after or a month later or whenever. Well, that makes no sense. Imagine if you said, I want to buy a \$1 million house today, but I will figure out how to pay for it next month; the bank would throw you out on the street. But that is the way the Republican leadership has chosen to operate.

By contrast, the Democratic budget proposal offers real budget enforcement rules. In fact, all of the alternative proposals do so: restoring pay-as-you-go rules to both spending and tax cuts. We provide for a strong defense in homeland security, including putting our troops first. We keep our commitment on No Child Left Behind, fund veterans health programs, health care, environmental protection, and housing; and Democrats target our tax relief to people who need it the most, those in the middle, including extending the child tax credit and marriage penalty relief.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, budgets are about priorities, and the Republican budget proposal before us has the wrong priorities for America. It is that simple. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican budget and to support a more thoughtful and realistic approach, and I would also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on the Budget reported out a budget that failed to address one of the most critical problems facing our Nation, and that is our national debt. I offered an amendment in committee that would have included the pay-go rules in that budget, pay-go on both revenue and spending legislation. It was defeated, sadly, on a straight party-line vote. Not one single Republican sup-

ported it, not even those who had previously and publicly said that they supported extending pay-go to both revenue and spending.

Yesterday I brought the same amendment to the Committee on Rules; and, again, the majority voted against the extension of the pay-go rules. And in doing so, they denied this House the opportunity to debate one of the most successful budget enforcement mechanisms that we have at our disposal.

Today we are over \$7 trillion in debt. By the chairman's own numbers, we will be over \$10.4 trillion in debt by the year 2009. Pay-go would allow us to rein in control over our debt and our deficits. Pay-go would mandate that we actually pay for the legislation that we pass. Pay-go would force the Congress to recognize that there are fiscal consequences to our actions. That is a wake-up call that we desperately need because, lately, Congress has been pretending that there are no consequences. We have been spending more than we have. We have been cutting taxes with abandon. We have squandered a \$256 billion surplus like it was monopoly money. Unfortunately, there is no such thing as a get-out-of-debt-free card, we cannot pass go, and we cannot collect \$7 trillion.

Now, our surpluses are gone and our deficits are predicted to be \$521 billion, a \$700 billion reversal in just 3 short years. That is not a surprise. We have been living far beyond our means, and a deficit explosion was the inevitable result.

The surprise is that some folks still do not believe it is a problem, and it is the unwillingness of these few people to acknowledge this problem that is preventing the rest of us from fixing the problem.

Our colleagues in the Senate get it. They see that a \$521 billion deficit does matter. They realize that it is not a good idea to finance tax cuts and spending increases by letting places like China, Japan, and the OPEC nations buy almost \$800 billion of our debt. They understand that their voters did not send them here to come up with fancy budget tricks that amount to little more than shell games and smoke and mirrors. Our colleagues in the Senate voted by a bipartisan majority to include an amendment identical to mine in their budget resolution: pay-go on both tax and spending legislation. The House needs to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, we need to hold ourselves to the same budgeting standards that we hold every family in this country. Whether we are increasing spending or decreasing revenue, we need to pay for it. We need to pay as we go.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this fiscally irresponsible rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget had a very extensive markup

session; I think we had roll call votes on something like 25 particular items to add to the budget in particular areas. So we had a vigorous debate on that. Yesterday, in the Committee on Rules, there was again vigorous debate on the amendments that were offered.

It has always been the tradition when we deal with the budget document, which I might add is the broad blueprint for our appropriation process that is coming up later on, but it has always been the tradition when we do the budget document that the amendments that we make in order are full substitutes.

The gentleman spoke about his concern of the pay-go issue, and one of the substitutes that we made in order, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget substitute, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), has precisely that issue within the substitute. So we will have a vigorous debate on that. The Committee on Rules made in order 40 minutes for each of those substitutes. I might add that three of the substitutes that we made in order come from the other side of the aisle, and one of those substitutes comes from our side of the aisle.

So we will, I think, have a vigorous debate on the issue that the previous speaker just brought up, and I think it will be a healthy debate; and then we will let the will of the House make that determination.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Washington, my friend, that, first of all, the Blue Dog budget has the pay-go provision in it. It would just make for a much more vigorous and a much more honest debate if we could, in fact, debate the very simple and basic idea that we pay for our bills; we do not just pass bills, we pay for them.

The fact of the matter is there is not one of us on either side of this aisle that could go back home and make that argument to our constituents where we would not understand that. They are not interested in the political inside-the-beltway mumbo jumbo; they know that we need to pay our bills, pay as we go, and that should be before this House to debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Thompson-Moore pay-as-you-go amendment. This amendment would require that any new mandatory spending or tax cuts must be paid for. Mr. Speaker, the amendment was offered in the Committee on Rules last night, but was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

For some reason, the Republican leadership is afraid to allow Members

the opportunity to vote on this responsible and reasonable proposal. Three years ago the budget deficit was shrinking and the economy was robust and growing; but, as Members have stated today, the leadership of the Republican Party has turned a balanced budget into record deficit spending. And here they go again, pushing a dangerous budget that will spiral the deficit out of control.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just do not see how we can continue this reckless, unchecked growth in our national debt. I believe deficit spending is a serious threat to our economy. The numbers are so high and out of control, they have almost lost their full impact. Republicans are throwing trillions of dollars around like it is pocket change. But it is not pocket change, Mr. Speaker; it is a staggering number, and it can crush any chance our Nation has of an economic recovery.

We must put something in place to halt the out-of-control deficit, and I think the Thompson-Moore pay-as-you-go amendment is a step in the right direction. A "no" vote on the previous question will let the American people know once and for all which Members stand in favor of reduced deficits, responsible spending, and fiscal restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials at this point in the RECORD, and I urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR RULE FOR H. RES. 574, H. CON. RES. 393—FY05 CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order as though printed as the first amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Thompson of California or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Sec. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 393, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the following periods:

(1) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the

most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and except as provided in paragraph (2), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this section, the terms "direct-spending legislation" and "revenue legislation" do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just remind Members that the Committee on Rules made in order three substitutes, and I erred when I said the Spratt amendment was only for 40 minutes; it is actually for 60 minutes. The other ones are for 40 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this closed rule and the underlying resolution. Yesterday afternoon, 35 amendments were offered during the Rules Committee hearing. Democrats offered amendments to increase funding for the No Child Left Behind Act, veterans' healthcare, job training programs, environmental cleanups, military survivor benefits, port security, first responders, affordable housing, and many other important domestic priorities.

However, of the 35 amendments offered, only 4 are made in order by this rule. As the current chairman of the Rules Committee once said, "If a rule isn't open, then it's closed." By the definition of the gentleman from California, this rule is closed, and I oppose it.

As my colleagues have already noted, we live in a trying time when fiscal constraints are overwhelming. The ongoing costs associated with an unprovoked war in Iraq have only added to the Bush recession, which the National Bureau for Economic Research has noted first began in March 2001. Our problems were exacerbated when the Bush tax cuts were signed into law. These tax cuts squandered raging surplus and have driven America's economy into the ground.

The Republican budget proposal is a reckless disregard of the obvious. It further increases our deficit and abandons the social contract this body has signed with the American people.

The Republican budget neglects America's children, seniors, and veterans. It underfunds our domestic priorities by billions, including veterans benefits, our education system, and perhaps most importantly during this dangerous time in history, homeland security.

To pay for their tax cuts, Republicans lay the groundwork for \$2.2 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program. With these cuts, states will

be forced to cover shortfalls in Federal commitments. At the same time, millions of America's poorest will find themselves homeless and uninsured with nobody to turn to.

Making a bad budget worse, the Republican proposal has the audacity to suggest that spending in Iraq will not be necessary beyond the upcoming fiscal year. Nothing could be further from the truth. This budget is as dishonest as the President's claims which got us into Iraq in the first place.

Even though I will oppose their budget, at the least the Republic Study Committee is honest about what it's doing.

Consideration of the budget resolution provides both parties with the opportunity to outline their priorities. Democrats will come to the floor today and offer our priorities to the American people. Our proposal is fiscally and socially responsible, while maintaining all of our international and domestic commitments.

Over the next 5 years, the Democratic budget provides nearly \$10 billion more than Republicans for appropriated education programs, \$6.6 billion more for veterans' programs, and \$5 billion more for homeland security.

We provide a realistic short- and long-term outlook for America's budget, and we ensure that domestic spending remains consistent with the costs of inflation. Democrats do all of this at the same time we balance the budget and cut the deficit.

Additionally, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus will offer our own budget. Our proposal is equally responsible and realistic. With increases in funding for America's schools, veterans, healthcare, and job training programs, the CBC budget reflects the consciousness of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is far less about politics than it is about priorities. After 6 hours of debate on the majority's budget proposal, it is clearer than ever: Republican priorities are not American priorities.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying resolution, and vote "yes" on all Democratic substitutes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting House Resolution 574, which provides for the consideration of the fiscal year 2005 budget resolution. H. Res. 574 is a fair, traditional rule for consideration of the annual budget resolution. The Rules Committee listened to hours of testimony yesterday and we have focused on making in order a selection of amendments submitted in the nature of a substitute. The rule before the House today provides for the consideration of four amendments in the nature of a substitute—three of which are Democrat substitutes—including the Blue Dog budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, the Democrat Leadership's and the Republican Study Committee budget.

With respect to H. Con. Res. 393, the underlying resolution, I want to commend Mr. NUSSLE, chairman of the Budget Committee, for all of his effort in bringing this very carefully-balanced resolution to the House floor. This budget reflects our commitment to the Nation's principles of strength, growth, and opportunity—to fund our Armed Forces and protect the people of the United States; to create jobs and strengthen the American economy; and to strengthen the foundation of this Nation that provides all Americans with unlimited op-

portunities, all while ensuring long-term fiscal responsibility.

H. Con. Res. 393 is an important step in the right direction toward balancing the budget. This resolution is designed to cut the deficit in half over the next 4 years. In addition, it protects President Bush's 2001 and 2003 tax relief proposals in order to ensure that the economy will keep moving forward and create more jobs.

The Budget Committee's resolution is in line with President Bush's FY 2005 budget request and seeks to hold the line on higher spending for most domestic discretionary programs, while increasing defense and homeland security spending to protect our citizens.

Once the budget resolution is passed, our next challenge is making sure that the 13 regular FY 2005 appropriations bills are within this budget's limits. It is extremely important for Congress to ensure our fiscal policy is sound in order to allow the Federal Reserve to maintain its current monetary policies, which can collectively serve to encourage job creation and growth in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed to debate the four substitute amendments as well as H. Con. Res. 393.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on: adopting House concurrent resolution 574, if ordered; H.R. 3786, H.R. 2993, and H.R. 254.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Cubin
Akin	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Bachus	Ginny	Cunningham
Baker	Burgess	Davis, Jo Ann
Ballenger	Burns	Davis, Tom
Barrett (SC)	Burr	Deal (GA)
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	DeLay
Barton (TX)	Buyer	DeMint
Bass	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, L.
Beauprez	Camp	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bereuter	Cannon	Doolittle
Biggart	Cantor	Dreier
Bilirakis	Capito	Duncan
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Dunn
Blackburn	Castle	Ehlers
Blunt	Chabot	Emerson
Boehlert	Chocola	English
Bonilla	Coble	Everett
Bonner	Cole	Feeney
Bono	Collins	Ferguson
Boozman	Cox	Flake
Bradley (NH)	Crane	Foley
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Forbes

Fossella	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Gallegly	Leach	Rohrabacher
Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerlach	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Gibbons	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Gilchrest	LoBiondo	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Gingrey	Manzullo	Schrock
Goode	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCrery	Sessions
Goss	McHugh	Shadegg
Granger	McKeon	Shaw
Graves	Mica	Shays
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Greenwood	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Gutknecht	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hall	Moran (KS)	Simmons
Harris	Murphy	Simpson
Hart	Musgrave	Smith (MI)
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Hayes	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Neugebauer	Souder
Hefley	Ney	Stearns
Hensarling	Northup	Sullivan
Herger	Norwood	Sweeney
Hobson	Nunes	Tancredo
Hoekstra	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Osborne	Terry
Houghton	Ose	Thomas
Hulshof	Otter	Thornberry
Hunter	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hyde	Paul	Tiberi
Isakson	Pearce	Toomey
Issa	Peterson (PA)	Turner (OH)
Istook	Petri	Upton
Jenkins	Pickering	Vitter
Johnson (CT)	Pitts	Walden (OR)
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Walsh
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Wamp
Jones (NC)	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Keller	Portman	Weller
Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Whitfield
Kennedy (MN)	Putnam	Wicker
King (IA)	Quinn	Wilson (NM)
King (NY)	Radanovich	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Ramstad	Wolf
Kirk	Regula	Young (AK)
Kline	Rehberg	Young (FL)
Knollenberg	Renzi	
Kolbe	Reynolds	

NAYS—201

Ackerman	Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)
Alexander	Dicks	Kildee
Allen	Dingell	Kilpatrick
Andrews	Doggett	Kind
Baca	Dooley (CA)	Klecza
Baird	Doyle	Kucinich
Baldwin	Edwards	Lampson
Ballance	Emanuel	Langevin
Becerra	Engel	Lantos
Bell	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Berman	Evans	Lee
Berry	Farr	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Filner	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Ford	Lofgren
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lowe
Boucher	Frost	Lucas (KY)
Boyd	Gephardt	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Majette
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Maloney
Brown, Corrine	Green (TX)	Markey
Capps	Grijalva	Marshall
Capuano	Gutierrez	Matheson
Cardin	Harman	Matsui
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)
Carson (IN)	Hill	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (OK)	Hinchey	McCollum
Case	Hinojosa	McDermott
Chandler	Holden	McGovern
Clyburn	Holt	McIntyre
Conyers	Honda	McNulty
Cooper	Hooley (OR)	Meehan
Costello	Hoyer	Meek (FL)
Cramer	Inslee	Meeks (NY)
Crowley	Israel	Menendez
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Michaud
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Millender-
Davis (CA)	(TX)	McDonald
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Miller (NC)
Davis (TN)	John	Miller, George
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Moore
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Moran (VA)
DeLauro	Kaptur	Murtha

Nadler	Rush	Stupak
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tanner
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Tauscher
Oberstar	Sánchez, Linda	Taylor (MS)
Obey	T.	Thompson (CA)
Olver	Sánchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Ortiz	Sanders	Tierney
Owens	Sandlin	Towns
Pallone	Schakowsky	Turner (TX)
Pascarell	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Pastor	Scott (GA)	Udall (NM)
Payne	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Pelosi	Serrano	Velázquez
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Skelton	Waters
Rahall	Slaughter	Watson
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Watt
Reyes	Snyder	Waxman
Rodriguez	Solis	Weiner
Ross	Spratt	Wexler
Rothman	Stark	Woolsey
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Wu
Ruppersberger	Strickland	Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie	Hoeffel	Tauzin
Boehner	McInnis	Weldon (PA)
Clay	Pence	
Davis (IL)	Price (NC)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). The Chair is advised that some of the voting stations may have been reset during this vote. Members should take care to confirm their vote, and the voting machines will be kept open until Members have a chance to vote and to confirm their vote.

□ 1123

Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Messrs. BERRY, BALLANCE, CONYERS, ENGEL and WEXLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2584. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Utrok Atoll local government of decommissioned National oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ship, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1218. An act to provide for Presidential support and coordination of interagency ocean science programs and development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research and monitoring program.

S. 2231. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94 (One Hundred Eighth Congress), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies—

the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST),

the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and

the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1501(b)(1)(C), title XV of Public Law 108-136, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve on the Veterans' Disability Benefits Commission:

Mr. Charles Joeckel of Washington, DC.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING SECURITY PRINTING ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3786.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3786, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—422

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter

Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehrlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza

Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes

Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica

Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sánchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus